

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,494	09/15/2005	Takatomo Sasaki	10873.1761USWO	7729
52835 7590 030602999 HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C. P.O. BOX 2902			EXAMINER	
			SONG, MATTHEW J	
MINNEAPOL	IS, MN 55402-0902		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

SASAKI ET AL.	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must finely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the

application, applicant must timely the one of the rollowing replies: (1) an amendment, amount, or other evidence, winch places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 3 To FR 4.1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (a) above, it checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any earmed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.77(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____ A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered bec	ause
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); 	

(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the

non-allowable claim(s).

7. No For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of

I.M. For purposes or appear, the proposed amendment(s); a) ____ will not be entered, or b) ____ will be entered and an explanation o
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _

Claim(s) objected to:

Claim(s) rejected io. _____. Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-12,14,17, 18, 20,21,24-27,30</u>.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 37.39 and 41.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 OFR 1.116(e).
- 9. In the affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. \(\bigcirc \) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

13. Other: .

/Robert M Kunemund/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792 Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 2/17/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument that there is an improvement in flatness is noted but not found persuasive. Yamada et al teaches a homogeneous epitaxial layer of uniform thickness is produced over the entire substrate by stirring (col 5, in 1-35); therefore improved flatness is expected by stirring.

Applicant's argument that even if the Yamada teachings increase uniformity in the vertical direction, the method seems not to increase the trickness of the crystal is noted but not found persuasive. Applicant alleges there is no reasonable basis to broibine. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimal invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motifivation to do so found either in the references therevelse or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1491 (Fed. Cir. 1992.). In this case, Yamada et all teaches increase in uniformity by story.

Applicant's argument regarding the differences in the process between Yamada and Kawamura are noted but not found persuasive. First, Yamada et al teaches an apparatus for LPE growth (Abstract and col 6, In 1-67); therefore conducting the Kawamura et al LPE process using the Yamada reference would have been obvious. Second, Kawamura et al does not limit the method of LPE growth by placing substrates horizontally. Kawamura et al does not exclude placing substrates obliquely to the horizontal axis. Third, Yamada et al teaches string increases uniformity, therefore rocking the Kawamura apparatus would have been obvious.

Applicant's argument that Yamada et al does not suggest rocking is noted but not found persussive. Yamada et al tilting the growth chamber to keep the solution in a homogenous condition to achieve uniform LPE growth (col 2, in 10-30 and col 4, in 50 to col 5, in 5) and rotation of the growth chamber as a periodic function of time during liquid phase growth (col 4, in 30-45), this clearly suggests rocking the chamber